



सत्यमेव जयते

INDIA NON JUDICIAL

Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi

e-Stamp

Certificate No.	: IN-DL96440758537292X
Certificate Issued Date	: 19-Nov-2025 03:10 PM
Account Reference	: IMPACC (IV)/ dl729603/ DELHI/ DL-ESD
Unique Doc. Reference	: SUBIN-DL72960320164872629535X
Purchased by	: VIDYA PRAKASH PATHAK
Description of Document	: Article 12 Award
Property Description	: Not Applicable
Consideration Price (Rs.)	: 0 (Zero)
First Party	: VIDYA PRAKASH PATHAK
Second Party	: Not Applicable
Stamp Duty Paid By	: VIDYA PRAKASH PATHAK
Stamp Duty Amount(Rs.)	: 100 (One Hundred only)



Please write or type below this line

V. P. PATHAK
H.J.S.
Former Judge
Sole Arbitrator

Statutory Alert:

1. The authenticity of this Stamp certificate should be verified at 'www.shcilestamp.com' or using e-Stamp Mobile App of Stock Holding Corporation of India. Any discrepancy in the details on this Certificate and as available on the website / Mobile App renders it invalid.
2. The onus of checking the legitimacy is on the users of the certificate.
3. In case of any discrepancy please inform the Competent Authority.

**BEFORE THE .IN REGISTRY OF INDIA
INDRP CASE NO. 2049
IN THE MATTER OF AN ARBITRATION UNDER THE .IN DOMAIN NAME
DISPUTE RESOLUTION POLICY; THE INDRP RULES OF PROCEDURE
AND THE ARBITRATION CONCILIATION ACT, 1996**

INDEX

S.NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
1.	Disputed Domain name and Registrar	2
2.	Arbitration Tribunal	2-3
3.	Parties to the Arbitration	3-4
4.	Facts of the case	4-6
5.	Contentions of the Parties	6-8
6.	Analysis	8-10
7.	Conclusion	10-11
8.	Order	11

VP Pathak
V. P. PATHAK
H.J.S.
Former Judge
Sole Arbitrator

**BEFORE THE .IN REGISTRY OF INDIA
INDRP CASE NO. 2049
IN THE MATTER OF AN ARBITRATION UNDER THE .IN DOMAIN NAME
DISPUTE RESOLUTION POLICY; THE INDRP RULES OF PROCEDURE
AND THE ARBITRATION CONCILIATION ACT, 1996**

ZAPP AG
Letmather Straße 69
58239 Schwerte
Germany

.... Complainant

Versus

Kartik Raichura
A/3, Blue Sky Chs, Carter Road 5,
Borivali East, Mumbai,
Maharashtra,
India

...Respondent

DISPUTE RELATING IN THE DOMAIN DISPUTE NAME

www.zapp.in

Award Dated- 2.01.2026

**BEFORE V.P. PATHAK
SOLE ARBITRATOR
AT NEW DELHI**

⇒ **DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME & REGISTRAR-**

The disputed domain name is registered through the Registrar of the disputed domain name info@dynadot.com which is accredited with the .IN registry and is listed on the of the website of the .IN registry.

⇒ **ARBITRATION TRIBUNAL-**

1. The Complainant has filed this Complaint for the disputed domain name, to be transferred to it. To decide this Complaint, NIXI has appointed the undersigned as Arbitrator. A consent letter with a declaration of impartiality by the undersigned to decide this case was sent to NIXI on 11.10.2025. The NIXI on 30.10.2025, appointed the undersigned as Arbitrator to proceed with the case.
2. The Tribunal primarily ordered the Complainant on 31.10.2025, to send the soft & hard copy of the Complaint along with Annexures to the Respondent & to send the Postal Slip of the same to the Tribunal. The Complainant on 31.10.2025, had sent the soft & hard copy along with other documents to the Respondent by Courier, the receipt of which was sent to the Tribunal on 4.11.2025 by the Complainant.

V. P. PATHAK
H.J.S.
Former Judge
Sole Arbitrator

3. As per **Rule 5 of the INDRP Rules** the Tribunal issued a notice dated 5.11.2025 calling upon the Respondent to file its reply on the Complaint within fifteen days from the date of receipt of the notice and rejoinder within fifteen days thereafter.
4. The respondent's authorised representative on 12.11.2025, sent his Power of Attorney. On 18.11.2025, the Respondent submitted its reply to the Complaint. A rejoinder request was also submitted by the Complainant on 19.11.2025 & it was given sufficient time till 28.11.2025. Lastly on 1.12.2025, the Respondent sent an email to the Tribunal regarding procedural concerns and other issues, which were taken on record.
5. The Tribunal is constituted under the INDRP Policy and Rules. Under rule 13, the Arbitration Proceedings must be conducted according to the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 2019 (as amended up to date) read with the Arbitration & Conciliation Act, Rules, Dispute Resolution Policy and its by-laws, and guidelines, as amended from time to time.
6. The Tribunal notes that both parties have actively participated in the proceedings by filing pleadings, replies, and supporting material. The factual matrix emerging from the Complaint, the Response, the rejoinder, and the Respondent's reply thereto has been taken on record in its entirety. These facts form the basis for determination of the issues arising under the .IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy.

⇒ **PARTIES TO THE ARBITRATION:**

7. The Complainant, ZAPP AG, is a German company founded in the year 1701 and is among the oldest industrial enterprises in continuous operation. The Complainant is engaged in the manufacture and supply of high-precision steel products, specialty alloys, and advanced metallic solutions serving diverse industrial sectors including automotive, aerospace, electronics, energy, medical technology, and industrial engineering. Over centuries of sustained commercial activity, the Complainant has acquired substantial goodwill and international recognition.
8. The Complainant is the registered proprietor of the trademark ZAPP in India and several foreign jurisdictions. Documentary evidence on record establishes statutory trademark rights, longstanding commercial use, extensive promotion, and a strong association of the mark ZAPP exclusively with the Complainant and its business. The Complainant also maintains a significant digital presence through its official domain <zapp.com>, registered in April 1999, which functions as a principal source of corporate and product-related information.
9. The Complainant has filed the instant Complaint challenging the registration of the domain name www.zapp.in under the ".in" Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy {INDRP} and the rules framed there under. The Complainant has preferred this arbitration by raising this dispute for the reprisal of its grievances.
10. **Rule 2 of INDRP Rules of Procedure** provides for communication/services of Complaint. Per this rule, the Respondent was sent a copy of the Complaint on the email shown in the domain name registration data in the .IN Registry's WHOIS database.
11. The Respondent is Mr. Kartik Raichura, an individual based in India, who is the registrant of the disputed domain name <zapp.in>. The Respondent has actively

V. P. PATHAK
H.J.S.
Former Judge
Sole Arbitrator

participated in the present proceedings by filing a detailed Response to the Complaint, a subsequent reply to the Complainant's rejoinder, and a supporting affidavit.

12. The Respondent asserts that the disputed domain name was adopted independently and in good faith, without any intention to target or derive benefit from the Complainant's trademark or goodwill. The Respondent contends that the term "ZAPP" was selected based on his own business rationale and that the disputed domain is used in connection with services that are distinct from the Complainant's core business.
13. The Respondent has also raised procedural objections during the course of the proceedings, particularly in relation to the scope and content of the Complainant's rejoinder. These objections have been placed on record and are duly noted as part of the Respondent's case.

⇒ **FACTS OF THE CASE:**

• **Complainant-**

14. The Complainant has placed on record certified copies and documentary material demonstrating that it is the lawful proprietor and long-standing user of the trademark ZAPP, which is protected in India as well as in several other jurisdictions. The trademark registrations relied upon by the Complainant cover multiple classes of goods and services and substantially pre-date the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name. The documents filed in support establish that the Complainant has used the mark ZAPP continuously and extensively in the course of trade, thereby acquiring statutory as well as common-law rights therein. **Annexures A & B.**
15. In addition to statutory protection, the Complainant has relied upon extensive material evidencing its global reputation, historical legacy, and sustained commercial presence. The record includes corporate profiles, historical accounts, product literature, and publicly available material demonstrating that the Complainant has been in operation for several centuries and that the mark ZAPP enjoys significant recognition in international markets. The Complainant submits that, through prolonged and consistent use, the mark has acquired distinctiveness and secondary meaning, functioning as a unique identifier of the Complainant's business. **Annexure C.**
16. The Complainant's core business expertise revolves around the manufacture of Steel and allied products such as Stainless Steel, Powder Metallurgical tools, High-Performance Alloys, Oil and Natural Gas Tools, and Medical Materials, especially Stents. The Complainant's products are used in Industries such as Automotive, Chemical processing, Electronics Engineering, Energy, Leisure and Lifestyle, Aviation, Machine and Plant Engineering, Medical alloys, Measurement and Control Technology, Oil and Gas Industry, Optical Industry etc.
17. The Complainant has further placed on record evidence of its official online presence, including the registration and continuous use of the domain name <zapp.com>, which has been operational since April 1999. WHOIS records and related material demonstrate that this domain has, for over two decades, functioned as the Complainant's primary digital interface for dissemination of corporate information, product offerings, and business communications. The Complainant submits that such sustained and exclusive online use has resulted in internet users, industry participants, and commercial counterparts associating the expression "ZAPP", when encountered in a domain name context, with the Complainant alone. **Annexure D.**

V. P. PATHAK
H.J.S.
Former Judge
Sole Arbitrator

VP Pathak

18. The Complainant has also placed on record material showing that its official domain <zapp.com> predates the registration of the disputed domain <zapp.in> by nearly two decades and has remained continuously operational throughout this period. According to the Complainant, this long-standing and uninterrupted use forms part of an established digital ecosystem through which customers, distributors, suppliers, and industry stakeholders routinely access information relating to the Complainant. The Complainant submits that such prior and consistent use is relevant to assessing how an ordinary internet user would perceive a subsequently registered, identical domain under the Indian country-code top-level domain.
19. The disputed domain name <zapp.in> was registered by the Respondent on 8.04.2019. The Complainant has produced screenshots and technical records showing that the disputed domain resolves to, or redirects users towards, a website offering services relating to website and blog creation. The Complainant contends that the use of an identical domain name under the Indian country-code top-level domain is likely to mislead internet users into believing that the Respondent's website is connected with, endorsed by, or affiliated with the Complainant, particularly for users searching for country-specific information. **Annexure E.**
20. The material on record further shows that the disputed domain does not remain inactive but is configured to resolve to, or redirect users towards, a website offering commercial services unrelated to the Complainant. The Complainant submits that such use is capable of capturing internet traffic intended for the Complainant, irrespective of whether the Respondent's services directly compete with those of the Complainant.
21. The Complainant further points out that the Respondent's website, as reflected in the material on record, does not contain any prominent disclaimer clarifying that it is unaffiliated with the Complainant. According to the Complainant, the absence of such clarification enhances the likelihood that internet users may assume a connection or association with the Complainant.
22. According to the Complainant, the Respondent's adoption and use of the disputed domain name is calculated to divert internet traffic intended for the Complainant's official platforms and to benefit from the goodwill associated with the ZAPP mark. The Complainant asserts that there is no plausible commercial justification for adopting an identical domain name when numerous alternative naming options were available, and contends that such adoption was neither coincidental nor innocent. **Annexure F.**
23. In the light of the Complainant's prior adoption of the mark ZAPP and the reputation and goodwill accrued thereto over a prolonged period of commercial use, the Complainant submits that the mark is perceived and identified by consumers, industry participants, and members of the trade as denoting the Complainant alone. The Complainant asserts that, in such circumstances, the adoption and use by a third party of an identical or confusingly similar mark or trading style, including in a domain name context such as "ZAPP", is inherently likely to result in confusion and deception among the relevant public, irrespective of the precise field of activity.
24. These factual assertions are relied upon by the Complainant to establish prior rights, likelihood of confusion, absence of legitimate interest, and bad faith registration and use under the INDRP.

• **Respondent-**

25. The Respondent has filed a detailed Response disputing the Complainant's allegations. The Respondent asserts that the domain name <zapp.in> was adopted independently and in good faith, without any intention to target the Complainant or exploit its

V. P. PATHAK
H.J.S.
Former Judge
Sole Arbitrator

trademark. The Respondent maintains that the term “ZAPP” was selected based on its own business considerations and denies knowledge of, or reliance upon, the Complainant’s trademark at the time of registration. The Respondent also contends that the services offered through the disputed domain are distinct in nature and scope from the Complainant’s business activities and that there is no realistic likelihood of confusion between the parties.

26. In support of its position, the Respondent has relied upon explanatory submissions and a sworn affidavit detailing the circumstances surrounding the registration and use of the disputed domain name. The Respondent submits that its adoption of the domain name was bona fide and that its conduct does not amount to misrepresentation, passing off, or bad-faith registration. The Respondent further contends that the services offered through the disputed domain are distinct in nature and scope from the Complainant’s business activities and that there is no realistic likelihood of confusion between the parties. It is the Respondent’s case that the Complainant operates in a different field and that mere identity of a word or mark does not, by itself, lead to infringement or bad faith. **Annexure G.**
27. The Tribunal notes, as a matter of record, that while the Respondent has relied upon affidavit evidence to explain the circumstances of adoption and use of the disputed domain name, the objective facts relating to the composition of the domain name, the timing of its registration, and its manner of use are not in dispute. These factual aspects emerge from documentary material placed on record by both parties.
28. Subsequent to the filing of the Response, the Complainant filed a rejoinder addressing the Respondent’s assertions and placing reliance on additional legal authorities and factual clarifications. The Respondent, in turn, submitted a reply to the rejoinder raising procedural concerns regarding the introduction of additional authorities at that stage and requesting that any reliance on such material be approached with due regard to procedural fairness. **Annexure H.**

CONTENTIONS OF PARTIES-

• COMPLAINANT:

29. The Complainant submits that it is the prior adopter, lawful proprietor, and exclusive owner of the trademark ZAPP, which enjoys statutory protection as well as substantial common-law rights arising from long and continuous use. Relying upon the trademark registrations and supporting documents placed on record, the Complainant contends that its rights in the mark ZAPP substantially pre-date the Respondent’s registration of the disputed domain name <zapp.in>. It is submitted that these registrations cover multiple classes of goods and services and conclusively establish the Complainant’s proprietary entitlement in the mark. **(Annexures A and B)**
30. The Complainant further relies upon extensive documentary material evidencing its global reputation, historical legacy, and sustained commercial presence over several centuries. According to the Complainant, such material demonstrates that the mark ZAPP is not a recently adopted or obscure identifier, but a distinctive mark that has acquired secondary meaning and significant goodwill in international markets. The Complainant submits that, through prolonged and consistent use, the mark ZAPP has come to function as a unique identifier exclusively associated with its business. **(Annexure C).**
31. In support of its online and digital presence, the Complainant places reliance on evidence relating to its official domain name <zapp.com>, which has been registered

V. P. PATHAK
H.J.S.
Former Judge
Sole Arbitrator

and continuously used since April 1999. The Complainant submits that this domain has, for over two decades, served as its principal digital interface for corporate communications, product dissemination, and engagement with customers, distributors, and industry stakeholders. It is contended that such long-standing online use has conditioned internet users to associate the term “ZAPP”, when encountered in a domain name context, exclusively with the Complainant. **(Annexure D)**

32. The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name <zapp.in>, registered by the Respondent on 8 April 2019, wholly incorporates the Complainant’s trademark without any modification or distinguishing element. Screenshots and technical records placed on record demonstrate that the disputed domain resolves to, or redirects users towards, a website offering commercial services relating to website and blog creation. According to the Complainant, the use of an identical domain name under the Indian country-code top-level domain is inherently misleading and likely to create an impression of association, endorsement, or affiliation with the Complainant, particularly for users seeking country-specific information. **(Annexure E)**
33. The Complainant submits that the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain is not passive or incidental, but is configured in a manner capable of capturing internet traffic intended for the Complainant’s official platforms. It is contended that such diversion is actionable under the INDRP irrespective of whether the Respondent’s services directly compete with those of the Complainant. The absence of any prominent disclaimer clarifying the lack of affiliation further aggravates the likelihood of confusion.
34. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. It is emphasized that the Respondent is neither commonly known by the name ZAPP nor authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted by the Complainant to use its trademark in any manner. In this regard, the Complainant relies upon settled INDRP jurisprudence, including *Instagram LLC v. Ding Riguo (INDRP/1183)*, wherein it was held that once a complainant establishes a prima facie case of absence of legitimate interest, the burden shifts to the respondent to demonstrate such interest. The Complainant further relies on *Wacom Co. Ltd. v. Liheng (INDRP/634)*, which held that absence of authorization from the trademark owner is fatal to any claim of legitimate use, and *Monster.com (India) Pvt. Ltd. v. Domain Leasing Company*, where it was reaffirmed that domain registrants bear an affirmative duty to ensure that their chosen domain does not infringe third-party rights.
35. On the issue of bad faith, the Complainant submits that the Respondent registered the disputed domain decades after the Complainant’s mark had acquired international recognition and after the Complainant had established a substantial digital footprint. According to the Complainant, the Respondent’s adoption of an identical domain under the Indian ccTLD is neither coincidental nor innocent, but a deliberate attempt to ride upon the goodwill associated with the ZAPP mark and to divert internet users for commercial advantage **(Annexure F)**.
36. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name after the Complainant acquired common law trademark rights in its mark "ZAPP". The disputed domain name appears to be registered by the Respondent with the sole purpose of selling it to the Complainant’s competitors. This shifts the burden of proof on the Respondent to produce evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.
37. Clause 3(d) of the INDRP requires a Respondent to not knowingly use the domain name in violation or abuse of any applicable laws or regulations. The obligations imposed by clause 3(d) are an integral part of the INDRP applicable to all the Respondents, and

V. P. PATHAK
H.J.S.
Former Judge
Sole Arbitrator

cannot be ignored, as was observed by the Ld. Arbitrator in the case- *Momondo A/S vs. Ijorghe Ghenrimopuzulu*, INDRP Case No 882.

38. Thus, the Complainant prays for IN Registry of NIXI to transfer the disputed domain name “zapp.in” to the Complainant along with the costs of the proceedings of the Complainant.

• **RESPONDENT:**

39. The Respondent disputes the Complainant’s allegations and submits that the domain name <zapp.in> was adopted independently and in good faith, without any intention to target the Complainant or exploit its trademark. The Respondent contends that the term “ZAPP” was selected based on its own business considerations and denies any knowledge of, or reliance upon, the Complainant’s trademark at the time of registration.
40. The Respondent further submits that the services offered through the disputed domain are distinct in nature and scope from the Complainant’s business activities and that there is no realistic likelihood of confusion between the parties. It is the Respondent’s case that mere identity of a word or mark, by itself, does not automatically result in infringement or bad faith, particularly where the parties operate in different fields.
41. In support of its position, the Respondent has relied upon explanatory submissions and a sworn affidavit detailing the circumstances surrounding the registration and use of the disputed domain name. The Respondent submits that its conduct does not amount to misrepresentation, passing off, or bad-faith registration under the INDRP. (**Annexure G**)
42. The Respondent has also raised procedural concerns in response to the Complainant’s rejoinder, particularly with regard to the introduction of additional authorities at a later stage. These objections have been placed on record through its reply to the rejoinder, with a request that any reliance on such material be approached with due regard to procedural fairness. (**Annexure H**)
43. In substance, the Respondent maintains that its adoption and use of the disputed domain name is bona fide, independent, and unconnected with the Complainant’s trademark or business. The Respondent asserts that its explanations, affidavit evidence, and procedural objections collectively demonstrate absence of intent to misappropriate the Complainant’s goodwill, and submits that the dispute ought to be assessed on the basis of these explanations and the surrounding factual circumstances placed on record.

ANALYSIS-

According to the above-mentioned facts of the case, the Tribunal must decide the following points-

A. Whether the Respondent’s domain zapp.in is identical and confusingly similar to the trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights.?

The Complainant has placed substantial material on record demonstrating statutory as well as common-law rights in the trademark ZAPP, acquired through long-standing use, international recognition, and continuous commercial exploitation. These rights substantially pre-date the Respondent’s registration of the disputed domain name <zapp.in>. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant’s trademark ZAPP in its entirety, without any alteration, modification, or distinguishing element. The only difference between the Complainant’s principal domain <zapp.com> and the disputed domain lies in the country-code top-level

V. P. PATHAK
H.J.S.
Former Judge
Sole Arbitrator

VP Pathak

domain “.in”, which, under settled INDRP jurisprudence, is immaterial for the purpose of assessing confusing similarity. The dominant and distinctive portion of the domain name remains identical to the Complainant’s trademark. It is well established that where a domain name wholly reproduces a complainant’s trademark, confusing similarity is established irrespective of differences in extension, jurisdictional suffix, or the nature of services offered. The use of a country-specific top-level domain (ccTLDs), particularly where the complainant operates internationally and maintains a long-standing digital presence, is more likely to reinforce an impression of official affiliation rather than dispel confusion. In the present case, the Complainant has demonstrated that its official domain <zapp.com> has been in continuous use since 1999, thereby conditioning internet users to associate the term “ZAPP”, when encountered in a domain name context, exclusively with the Complainant. In such circumstances, an ordinary internet user encountering the domain <zapp.in> would reasonably assume that it represents the Complainant’s Indian presence or an authorised regional extension. The Respondent has relied upon the decision in *Mastercard International Inc. v. Champion Software Technologies Ltd (INDRP/978)* to contend that mere identity of a mark may not, by itself, be determinative of confusing similarity. That decision, however, turned on its own specific factual matrix, including the descriptive nature of the expression involved and the contextual manner in which the domain was used. The present case is materially distinguishable. The mark ZAPP is neither descriptive nor generic in relation to the Complainant’s business, and the Complainant has placed on record extensive material establishing its distinctiveness and secondary meaning. Further, unlike in the cited decision, the disputed domain name here is identical to the Complainant’s trademark and is capable, by its very composition, of conveying an impression of association, particularly when used under a country-code top-level domain corresponding to a significant market of the Complainant. In conclusion, the disputed domain name <zapp.in> is identical and confusingly similar in appearance, sound, meaning, and overall commercial impression to the Complainant’s trademark ZAPP, thereby satisfying the first requirement under the INDRP.

B. Whether the Respondent has any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name?

The Complainant has established a strong prima facie case that the Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is neither commonly known by the name “ZAPP” nor has it been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted by the Complainant to use the mark in any manner. Once such a prima facie case is made out, the burden shifts to the Respondent to demonstrate rights or legitimate interests. This principle has been consistently affirmed under the INDRP, including in *Instagram LLC v. Ding Riguo (INDRP/1183)* and *Wacom Co. Ltd. v. Liheng (INDRP/634)* as mentioned above. While the Respondent has filed a Response and supporting affidavit asserting independent adoption, mere assertions of good faith, unsupported by compelling objective evidence, are insufficient to displace the Complainant’s prior rights. The Respondent contends that its services are distinct from those of the Complainant. However, under domain name jurisprudence, legitimacy is not determined solely by comparison of goods or services. The critical inquiry is whether the Respondent is entitled to appropriate the trademark of another as a domain name. The identity of the domain itself carries an inherent risk of confusion, diversion, and misleading, regardless

V. P. PATHAK
H.J.S.
Former Judge
Sole Arbitrator

of the specific nature of services offered. The record also shows that the Respondent's website does not contain any prominent disclaimer clarifying the absence of affiliation with the Complainant. In the digital environment, where users often make rapid assumptions based on domain names alone, such omission further weakens any claim of bona fide or legitimate use. The Respondent's adoption of a domain name identical to a well-established mark, without demonstrable necessity or justification, fails to meet this standard.

In conclusion, the Respondent has not discharged the burden of establishing any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and its explanations do not sufficiently negate the likelihood of confusion arising from the adoption of <zapp.in>.

C. Whether the Respondent's domain name is registered or is being used in absolute bad faith?

The circumstances surrounding the registration and use of the disputed domain name, when examined cumulatively, point towards bad faith within the meaning of the INDRP. The Respondent registered <zapp.in> in 2019, long after the Complainant had acquired substantial statutory rights, global reputation, and an established online presence under the mark ZAPP. The selection of an identical domain name under the Indian country-code top-level domain is not a neutral act. In the context of an internationally recognized mark with a long-standing digital footprint, such adoption is capable of diverting internet users seeking the Complainant's official platforms. The redirection of the disputed domain to a commercially active website further reinforces the inference that the domain is not passively held but is being used in a manner capable of generating commercial advantage. Bad faith need not be confined to direct competition. As recognized in several INDRP decisions, including *Momondo A/S v. Ijorghe Ghenrimopuzulu* (INDRP/882), knowingly using a domain name in violation of another's trademark rights, or in a manner that exploits confusion, falls squarely within prohibited conduct under Clause 3(d) of the INDRP.

While the Respondent has asserted good-faith adoption through affidavit evidence, the objective indicators—namely the identity of the domain, the timing of registration, the absence of distinguishing elements, and the manner of use—carry greater evidentiary weight. Domain name disputes are decided on the basis of overall circumstances rather than subjective intent alone. Panels have consistently held that exploitation of goodwill and use of a confusingly similar domain name for commercial advantage constitutes bad faith. In *Eureka Forbes Ltd. v. Gomez* and *Colgate Palmolive Co. v. Go On Communication*, such conduct was held to be incompatible with good-faith registration or use. These principles are instructive in assessing the Respondent's conduct in the present case.

The Respondent's conduct, viewed holistically, demonstrates both targeting of the Complainant's mark and use that defeats any claim of good-faith adoption. The continued use of an identical domain name, despite the existence of alternative naming options, supports the inference that the Respondent sought to benefit from the Complainant's established goodwill and reputation.

⇒ CONCLUSION-

44. Considering the pleadings, documentary evidence, submissions of both parties, and the analysis undertaken herein, the Tribunal is of the view that the Complainant has

V. P. PATHAK
H.J.S.
Former Judge
Sole Arbitrator

successfully established all the essential elements required under the .IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy. The Complainant has demonstrated prior statutory and common-law rights in the trademark ZAPP, and has shown that such rights substantially pre-date the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name.

45. The Tribunal further notes that the disputed domain name <zapp.in> differs from the Complainant's established domain <zapp.com> only by the country-code top-level domain ".in". Under settled principles of domain name jurisprudence, the gTLD or ccTLD is a technical requirement of registration and does not serve to distinguish the disputed domain name from the underlying trademark. The dominant and distinctive element of the domain name remains identical to the Complainant's mark.
46. In view of the foregoing, the Tribunal finds that the Respondent had no legitimate basis to appropriate the Complainant's mark as the entirety of its domain name and that the registration and use of the disputed domain name does not defeat the Complainant's proprietary rights.
47. The Complainant has the full right and ownership of the domain name "zapp.in". So, the Complaint is allowed.
48. This Award is being passed as per Clause 5 (e) of the INDRP Rules, and Arbitration Act, 1996.

49. **ORDER-**

50. The .IN Registry of NIXI is directed to transfer the disputed domain name "zapp.in." to the Complainant forthwith. Registry to do the needful.
51. Parties to bear their own costs.
52. This Award is passed today at New Delhi on 2.01.2026.

V.P.Pathak
 V. P. PATHAK
 H.J.S.
 Former Judge
 Sole Arbitrator
Date- 2.01.2026